arXiv:1302.3174v1 [gr-qc] 13 Feb 2013

STATES OF LOW ENERGY ON HOMOGENEOUS AND INHOMOGENEOUS, EXPANDING SPACETIMES

KOLJA THEM AND MARCOS BRUM

Abstract. We will construct states on the algebra of the Klein-Gordon field that minimize the energy density for homogeneous and for inhomogeneous spacetimes. The energy density will be measured by geodesic observers and smeared over a timelike slab of spacetime, containing entirely a Cauchy hypersurface and extended in time. We further show that these states are Hadamard states. These constructions generalize the construction of States of Low Energy on Robertson-Walker spacetimes presented by Olbermann [1].

1. Introduction

The algebraic approach to quantum field theory allows for a complete formulation of the theory in terms of the algebra satisfied by the observables, which are a subset of all field operators. This becomes even more powerful in curved spacetime, because then there are, in general, no symmetries and, in particular, no time translation symmetry, therefore there is not a well-defined concept of vacuum state. The formulation of the interacting field theory in Globally Hyperbolic spacetimes in this framework was already achieved [2, 3, 4]. Although states are not used to set the foundations of the theory, those can be obtained by means of the GNS construction, which provides, for each positive functional over the algebra of observables, a representation of this algebra as operators on a Hilbert space, spanned by a cyclic vector [5]. States are needed for the evaluation of expectation values.

Although both the physical and mathematical foundations of the concept of state have already been layed down, its determination in explicit cases is not a trivial task. Besides, the fact that the fields, solutions to the equations of motion (see section (2) below), are distributions, requires that we analyze the singularity structure of the states. The physically sensible concept of state is that of *Hadamard states*. It has been shown that the expectation value of the energy-momentum tensor on these states, on curved spacetimes, is coherently renormalizable, that the singularity structure of these states reduces to the singularity structure of the vacuum state, when one analyzes it on Minkowski spacetime, and that quasifree[1] Hadamard states form a local quasiequivalence class [6, 7, 8, 9].

Parker [10] constructed states for asymptotically flat Robertson-Walker spacetime, the so called *Adiabatic states*. These states were intended to minimize the production of asymptotically free particles, but this asymptotic freedom was not verified, and neither was this construction free of mathematical problems. Later on, Lüders and Roberts [11] gave a mathematically well-defined definition of adiabatic states and proved that any two adiabatic states are locally quasiequivalent. More recently, Junker and Schrohe [12] have extended this definition for globally hyperbolic spacetimes and showed that, under certain conditions, the adiabatic states are Hadamard states.

---

[1] Quasifree states are states completely described by its two-point function. See section (2.2).

It is long known that the expectation value of the renormalized energy density of a scalar field in curved spacetime, despite the coherent renormalization it undergoes, possesses no lower bound [13]. This would give rise to violations of the second law of thermodynamics, as well as generate pathological spacetimes (allowing for time travel). On another hand, if instead of calculating the renormalized energy density on a point of spacetime, one smears it with a smooth test function of compact support along the worldline of a causal observer, one finds that the resulting quantity is not arbitrarily negative. More recently it has been shown that this result can be extended to smearing over a timelike submanifold of spacetime. These results are known as Quantum Energy Inequalities (QEIs) [14, 15].

Inspired by these results, Olbermann [1] constructed a state for the field algebra on Robertson-Walker spacetime which is invariant under its symmetries (rotations on the spatial hypersurface), takes into account the necessity of smearing along a timelike submanifold and minimizes the expectation value of the smeared renormalized energy density. Besides, using the adiabatic ansatz as initial condition for the scalar field and analyzing the singularity structure of this state, he was able to show that this State of Low Energy (SLE) is a Hadamard State.

In this work, we generalize this construction in two different ways. First, we consider spacetimes whose Cauchy surfaces are homogeneous and compact without boundary and show how to define symmetric states on these spacetimes. These encompass the well known Bianchi spacetimes [16]. Second, we consider expanding spacetimes whose Cauchy surfaces have no spatial symmetries - still compact without boundary -, and we smear the energy density with respect to geodesic observers. We prove that states can be chosen which both minimize the energy density and satisfy the Hadamard condition. Besides, it will become clear that the latter case generalizes the former one.

On section (2) we present the scalar field quantization according to the algebraic approach. On section (3) we introduce the original concept of States of Low Energy. Finally, on section (4), we show our generalizations and how they extend the original definition.

2. SCALAR FIELD QUANTIZATION ON GLOBALLY HYPERBOLIC SPACETIMES

2.1. **Quantized scalar field.**

Globally Hyperbolic spacetimes $\mathcal{M}$ are spacetimes that admit a foliation into nonintersecting spatial hypersurfaces Σ of codimension 1 such that every inextendible causal curve intersects each of these hypersurfaces exactly once. They have the topological structure $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R} \otimes \Sigma$. For any subset $S \subset \Sigma$ one can define its *Domain of Dependence* $D(S)$ as the set of points $p \in \mathcal{M}$ such that every inextendible causal curve through p intersects S. Clearly, $D(\Sigma) = \mathcal{M}$. The determination of the solution of the equations of motion on S fixes uniquely the field configuration at any point of spacetime contained in $D(S)$ [7].

It is well known [9] that the wave equation of a massive scalar field on such a spacetime admits unique retarded and advanced fundamental solutions, which are maps $\mathbb{E}^{\pm} : C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \to C^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, such that, for $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) =: \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\left(\Box + m^2\right)\mathbb{E}^{\pm} f = \mathbb{E}^{\pm}\left(\Box + m^2\right) f = f \tag{1}$$

and

$$\mathrm{supp}(\mathbb{E}^{\pm} f) \subset J^{\pm}(\mathrm{supp} f)\ .$$

The functions $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$ are called test functions, and $P := \Box + m^2$ will denote the differential operator. From the fundamental solutions, one defines the *advanced-minus-retarded-operator* $\mathbb{E} := \mathbb{E}^- - \mathbb{E}^+$ as a map $\mathbb{E} : C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathcal{D}'(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathcal{D}'(\mathcal{M})$ being the space of distributions in $\mathcal{M}$. Using $\mathbb{E}$, we define the hermitean form

$$\sigma(f,g) = -\int \mathrm{d}^4x\,\sqrt{|g|}\,f(x)(\mathbb{E}g)(x) = -E(f,g)\,. \tag{2}$$

The symbols $\Phi(f)$, satisfying

$$P\Phi(f) = \Phi\,(Pf) = 0 \tag{3}$$

and the following properties:

(i) Φ is a linear operator over the field of complex numbers;
(ii) $\Phi(\overline{f}) = \Phi(f)^*$;
(iii) $[\Phi(f),\Phi(g)] = -i\sigma(f,g)\mathbb{1}$, where $[\cdot,\cdot]$ is the commutator and $\mathbb{1}$ is the unit element,

generate an algebra $\mathscr{F}$, the *CCR*-algebra. From (3) it is immediate to see that, for different test functions $f,h,k \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $f - h = Pk$, $\Phi(f) = \Phi(h)$. Therefore, the space of test functions can be replaced by the quotient space $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})/\mathrm{Ran}P =: \mathsf{K}(\mathcal{M})$[2]. The pair $(\mathrm{Re}(\mathsf{K}(\mathcal{M})),\sigma)$ forms a symplectic vector space.

As a solution to (3), the symbol $\Phi(f)$ is a functional over test functions $f(x)$,

$$\Phi(f) = \int \mathrm{d}^4x\,\sqrt{|g|}\,\phi(x)f(x)\,,$$

where $\phi(x)$ is a distribution. The functional will be called *field functional*, and the distribution $\phi(x)$, simply *field*.

This algebra does not have a norm. To get a normed algebra we first restrict our attention to the space of real valued test functions $\mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}))$, on which the symplectic form becomes a real symplectic form. Now, we define the symbols $W(f)$, for $f,g \in \mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}))$, with the properties

(I) $W(0) = \mathbb{1}$;
(II) $W(-f) = W(f)^*$;
(III) $W(f)W(g) = e^{-i\frac{\sigma(f,g)}{2}}W(f+g)$.

These symbols generate the *Weyl algebra* $\mathscr{W}\,(\mathrm{Re}(\mathsf{K}(\mathcal{M})),\sigma)$.

The Weyl algebra admits the norm (for $f_i \in \mathrm{Re}(\mathsf{K}(\mathcal{M}))$, $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$)

$$\|A\|_1 = \|\sum_{i=1}^{n}\lambda_i W(f_i)\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n}|\lambda_i|_1\,. \tag{4}$$

This norm clearly satisfies $\|AB\|_1 \leqslant \|A\|_1\|B\|_1$ and $\|A^*\|_1 = \|A\|_1$. A new norm can be defined from this one. Let

$$a_n := \|(A^*A)^{2^n}\|_1^{2^{-(n+1)}}\,. \tag{5}$$

This is a sequence of monotonically decreasing positive numbers. That this sequence is bounded is obvious from

$$\|(A^*A)^{2^n}\|_1^{2^{-(n+1)}} = \|\underbrace{(A^*A)\ldots(A^*A)}_{2^n\ \text{terms}}\|_1^{2^{-(n+1)}} \leqslant \Big(\underbrace{\|A\|_1^2\ldots\|A\|_1^2}_{2^n\ \text{terms}}\Big)^{2^{-(n+1)}} = \|A\|_1\,.$$

Now, we define

$$\|A\| := \lim_{n\to\infty} a_n\,. \tag{6}$$

---

[2] By $\mathrm{Ran}P$ is meant the *range* of the operator P, that is, the elements $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $f = Ph$ for some $h \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M})$.

The proof that the norm (6) is a C^*-norm, that is, $||A^*A|| = ||A||^2$, is very simple:

$$\begin{aligned} ||A^*A|| &= \lim_{n\to\infty} ||(A^*AA^*A)^{2^n}||_1^{2^{-(n+1)}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} ||(A^*A)^{2^{n+1}}||_1^{2^{-(n+1)}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} ||(A^*A)^{2^{n+1}}||_1^{2^{-(n+2)+1}} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(||(A^*A)^{2^{n+1}}||_1^{2^{-(n+2)}} \right)^2 = ||A||^2 \qquad \square \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The last equality stems from the fact that, since a_n is a sequence of bounded positive numbers, so is $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n$ bounded, and it is straightforward to show that, in this case, $\lim_{n\to\infty}(a_n)^2 = (\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n)^2$. Completing the algebra with respect to this norm, $\mathscr{W}$ becomes a unital C*-algebra.

Dimock [17] showed that the *CCR*-algebra can equivalently be constructed using the initial value fields, by setting $\phi = \mathbb{E}f$ and $\psi = \mathbb{E}g$, f and g test functions: one defines the restriction operators $\rho_0 : \phi \mapsto \phi_{\restriction\Sigma} =: \phi_0$ and $\rho_1 : \phi \mapsto (\partial_n\phi)_{\restriction\Sigma} =: \phi_1$ (and similarly for ψ), where ∂_n is the derivative in the direction of the vector n, normal to Σ. The new space of functions is given by

$$L(\Sigma) = \left\{ (\phi_0, \phi_1) \in C^\infty(\Sigma) \otimes C^\infty(\Sigma) \right\} , \tag{8}$$

and the symplectic form,

$$\sigma(f,g) = -\int_\Sigma \mathrm{d}^3x \sqrt{|g_{\restriction\Sigma}|} \left(\overline{\phi}_0(x)\psi_1(x) - \psi_0(x)\overline{\phi}_1(x) \right) . \tag{9}$$

(9) does not dependend on the Cauchy surface at which it is calculated. The mapping $\beta : K \to L$, $\phi \mapsto (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ is an isomorphism that preserves the symplectic form.

This whole construction takes a very familiar form if we consider Globallly Hyperbolic spacetimes with metric of the form (on the following, $\underline{x}$ denotes the spatial coordinates of a point on the manifold)

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - c(t)^2 h_{ij}(\underline{x}) dx^i dx^j . \tag{10}$$

Later on we will discuss how general is this form. We will call such of spacetimes *Expanding Spacetimes*. Here, $c(t)$ is a positive function of time, the so called *scale factor*, and $h_{ij}(\underline{x})$ is the metric on the Riemannian hypersurfaces. The Klein-Gordon equation for a scalar field $\phi(t, \underline{x})$ assumes, then, the form (to be understood as the distributional kernel of (3))

$$\left(\partial_t^2 + 3\frac{\dot{c}(t)}{c(t)}\partial_t - \frac{\Delta_h}{c(t)^2} + m^2 \right) \phi(t, \underline{x}) = 0 . \tag{11}$$

If the Riemannian hypersurfaces are compact - which will be the case in the problems treated below - the Laplace operator Δ_h is a self-adjoint operator whose eigenvalues form a discrete spectrum [18] and, as such, its eigenfunctions form a complete orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Sigma)$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_j \overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x})\mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{y}) = (|h|)^{-1/2}\delta(\underline{x} - \underline{y}) \\ &\int \mathrm{d}^3x \sqrt{|h|}\, \overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x})\mathrm{Y}_l(\underline{x}) = \delta_{jl} . \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The field can then be expanded in this basis,

$$\phi(t, \underline{x}) = \sum_j \left(T_j(t)\overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x}) + \overline{T}_j(t)\mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x}) \right) , \tag{13}$$

and Δ_h operating on an eigenfunction, gives

$$\Delta_h \mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x}) = -\lambda_j \mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x}) . \tag{14}$$

Therefore, (11) becomes

$$\left(\partial_t^2 + 3\frac{\dot{c}(t)}{c(t)}\partial_t + \frac{\lambda_j}{c(t)^2} + m^2\right)T_j(t) = 0 \,. \tag{15}$$

To simplify following equations, we define the "frequency"

$$\omega_j^2(t) := \frac{\lambda_j}{c(t)^2} + m^2 \,. \tag{16}$$

We can choose initial conditions such that

$$\left[\phi_0(0,\underline{x}),\phi_0(0,\underline{y})\right] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left[\phi_0(0,\underline{x}),\phi_1(0,\underline{y})\right] = i(|h|)^{-1/2}\delta(\underline{x}-\underline{y}) \,.$$

Taking this and (12) into account,

$$\dot{T}_j(t)\overline{T}_j(t) - T_j(t)\dot{\overline{T}}_j(t) = \frac{i}{c(t)^3} \,, \tag{17}$$

where the left-hand side is the Wronskian, what means that the solutions to (15) are complex distributions, and $T_j(t)$, $\overline{T}_j(t)$ are linearly independent.

Since the differential operator of equation (15) is a linear, symmetric, second order operator, its solutions can be written as

$$T_j(t) = \alpha_j S_j(t) + \beta_j \overline{S}_j(t) \,, \tag{18}$$

for $S_j(t)$ also a solution to (15), satisfying (17). The parameters α_j and β_j are then subject to

$$|\alpha_j|^2 - |\beta_j|^2 = 1 \,. \tag{19}$$

The solutions to equation (15) have only two degrees of freedom. Taking into account the absolute values and phases of α_j and β_j, subject to (19), there is still one degree left to our choice. Throughout this paper, we choose β_j to be a real parameter.

2.2. States and the Hadamard condition.

States ω are functionals over the algebra $\mathscr{F}(\mathcal{M})$, with the following properties:

Linearity: $\omega(\alpha A + \beta B) = \alpha\omega(A) + \beta\omega(B)$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $A, B \in \mathscr{F}(\mathcal{M})$;
Positive-semidefiniteness: $\omega(A^*A) \geq 0$;
Normalization: $\omega(\mathbb{1}) = 1$.

The *n−point functions* of ω are defined as

$$w_\omega^{(n)}(f_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes f_n) := \omega(\Phi(f_1)\ldots\Phi(f_n)) \,.$$

Linearity extends to the higher point functions, i.e., $w_\omega^{(n)} : \mathscr{F}^{\otimes n} \to \mathbb{C}$ is linear in each of its arguments. In the present work we will focus on states which are completely described by its two-point function, the so called *Quasifree States*. All odd point functions vanish identically and the higher even point functions can be written as

$$w_\omega^{(2n)}(f_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes f_{2n}) = \sum_p \prod_{k=1}^{n} w_\omega^{(2)}(f_{p(k)}, f_{p(k+n)}) \,,$$

where $w_\omega^{(2n)}$ is the $2n$-point function associated to the state ω, $w_\omega^{(2)}(f_{p(k)}, f_{p(k+n)}) \equiv \omega(f_{p(k)}, f_{p(k+n)})$ and the sum runs over all permutations of $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ which satisfy $p(1) < \ldots < p(n)$ and $p(k) < p(k+n)$. We call a state *pure* if it is not a convex combination of two distinct states, i.e.,

$$\nexists \omega_1, \omega_2 \text{ functionals over } \mathscr{F},\ \lambda \in (0,1) \mid \omega = \lambda\omega_1 + (1-\lambda)\omega_2 \,.$$

The existence of representations of the fields as operators on a certain Hilbert space is achieved by means of the GNS construction: given an algebra and a pure, positive linear functional on this algebra - one may start with a positive semi-definite functional and take the quocient of the algebra by the left ideal given by

$$\mathcal{N}_\omega = \{F\,;F \in \mathscr{F}\ ,\ \omega(F^*F) = 0\}\ ,$$

there is, associated to this functional ω, a unique irreducible representation $(\mathscr{H}_\omega, \pi_\omega)$, consisting of a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_\omega$ and a representation π_ω of the algebra $\mathscr{F}$ as operators on this Hilbert space. Also, $\exists \Omega \in \mathscr{H}_\omega$ such that, $\forall F \in \mathscr{F}$, $\omega(F) = \langle \Omega | \pi_\omega(F) | \Omega \rangle$, and Ω is a cyclic vector in $\mathscr{H}_\omega$.

The physically meaningful states are the Hadamard states, which are characterized by their singularity structure in cotangent space. This characterization is reminiscent of the spectral condition on Minkowski spacetime. It is also known that the expectation value of the energy-momentum tensor on these states has a sensible renormalization [6, 7]. After [19], the definition of Hadamard states has been given in terms of the Wavefront set *WF* of the two-point distribution corresponding to the state [20]. The advantage of this approach is that the *WF* is a geometrical object, therefore the location of singularities can be coherently analyzed, even in curved spacetimes. Besides, it permits the incorporation of interacting field theories in the algebraic approach [2, 3, 4]. We will present this definition now.

Let v be a distribution of compact support, $v \in \mathcal{E}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$. If $\forall N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\exists C_N \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$|\hat{v}(k)| \leqslant C_N \left(1 + |k|\right)^{-N}\ ,\ k \in \mathbb{R}^n\ , \tag{20}$$

then v is in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Accordingly, the singular support singsupp v is defined as the set of points having no neighborhood where v is in C^∞. Besides, we define the cone $\Sigma(v)$ as the set of points $k \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ having no conic neighborhood V such that (20) is valid when $k \in V$.

For a general distribution $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$, X and open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $\phi \in C_0^\infty(X)$, $\phi(x) \neq 0$, we define

$$\Sigma_x(u) := \bigcap_\phi \Sigma(\phi u)\ .$$

Definition 2.2.1. *If $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$, then we call the Wavefront set of u the closed subset of $X \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ defined by*

$$WF(u) = \{(x, k) \in X \times (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}) | k \in \Sigma_x(u)\}\ .$$

On a manifold, the *WF* is a subset of the cotangent space.

Definition 2.2.2. *A state ω is said to be a Hadamard state if its two-point distribution ω_2 has the following Wavefront set:*

$$WF(\omega_2) = \left\{(x_1, k_1; x_2, -k_2)\, |(x_i, k_i) \in \mathcal{T}^*_{x_i}\mathcal{M} \setminus \{0\}; (x_1, k_1) \sim (x_2, k_2); k_1 \in \overline{V}_+\right\} =: C^+ \tag{21}$$

where $(x_1, k_1) \sim (x_2, k_2)$ means that there is a null geodesic connecting x_1 and x_2, k_1 is the cotangent vector to this geodesic at x_1 and k_2, its parallel transport, along this geodesic, at and x_2. $\overline{V}_+$ is the closed forward light cone of $\mathcal{T}^*_{x_1}\mathcal{M}$.

One useful property of *WF*, which will be used later, is that, for two distributions ϕ and ψ,

$$WF(\phi + \psi) \subseteq WF(\phi) \cup WF(\psi)\ , \tag{22}$$

and equality holds if the *WF* of one of the distributions is empty, i.e., if one of them is smooth.

2.3. **Quasifree states on Homogeneous spacetimes.**

The spatial hypersurfaces are Riemannian submanifolds, and we will now present the definition of homogeneity on them.

Definition 2.3.1. *Let G be a group of isometries from the Riemannian manifold Σ to itself, i.e., $g \in G$ is a diffeomorphism from Σ to itself and $\forall g \in G$, $g^*h = h$, where h is the metric on Σ. If for every pair of points $p, q \in \Sigma$, $\exists g' \in G$ such that $g'p = q$, then the group G is said to act transitively on Σ. A Riemannian manifold with a transitive group of isometries is called homogeneous* [18].

The action of the group G as a group of isometries on a point $(t, x) \in \mathcal{M}$ is $g(t, x) = (t, gx)$, where $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \Sigma$. Besides, it commutes with the mapping $\mathbb{E} : C_0^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathcal{D}'(\mathcal{M})$, so it acts as a group of Bogolubov transformations on the phase space and induces a group of automorphisms of the CCR-algebra and of the Weyl algebra. A quasifree state ω is said to be symmetric if $\omega \circ \alpha_g = \omega$. G has a unitary representation $U \oplus U$ on $L^2(\Sigma) \oplus L^2(\Sigma)$, given by $U(g)f = f \circ g^{-1}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_g\left(W(f)\right) &= W(f \circ g^{-1}) \\ \alpha_g\left(\phi(f)\right) &= \phi(f \circ g^{-1})\,. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

A generalized Fourier transformation can be defined:

$$\tilde{f}(j) := \left(Y_j, f\right)_{L^2} = \int \mathrm{d}^3x\, \sqrt{|h|}\, \overline{Y}_j(\underline{x}) f(x)\,. \tag{24}$$

The riemannian metric on Σ induces a scalar product on L. Working with the initial value fields, $F = (F_0, F_1) = (\rho_0\mathbb{E}f, \rho_1\mathbb{E}f)$ and $Q = (Q_0, Q_1) = (\rho_0\mathbb{E}q, \rho_1\mathbb{E}q)$, we have

$$(F, Q) = \int \mathrm{d}^3x\, \sqrt{|h|}\, \left(\overline{F}_0 Q_0 + \overline{F}_1 Q_1\right)\,. \tag{25}$$

By letting the laplacian act componentwise, we define the norms $\|\cdot\|_\nu$ by

$$\|F\|_\nu^2 := \left(F, (-\Delta_h + m^2)^{2\nu} F\right)\,, \quad \nu \in \mathbb{N}_0\,, \tag{26}$$

and require joint continuity of $w^2_{\omega_G} : L \otimes L \to \mathbb{C}$ with respect to this topology. This means that there is an integer ν and a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|w^{(2)}_{\omega_G}(F, Q)| \leqslant C\|F\|_\nu \|Q\|_\nu\,. \tag{27}$$

Completing L in the norm $\|\cdot\|_\nu$, we obtain a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_\nu$. By the Riesz Representation Theorem, there is a bounded operator $\hat{S}$ on $\mathscr{H}_\nu$ such that

$$w^{(2)}_{\omega_G}(F, Q) = \left(F, \hat{S}Q\right)_\nu\,. \tag{28}$$

The action of G on L is isometric for each of the norms $\|\cdot\|_\nu$. Therefore, symmetry of the state ω_G amounts to the requirement that $\hat{S}$ commutes with the action of the group G, whence the operator $\hat{S}$ decomposes diagonally on the base of eigenfunctions of the laplacian. Hence,

$$w^{(2)}_{\omega_G}(F, Q) = \sum_j \langle \tilde{\overline{F}}(j), \widetilde{\hat{S}(Q)}(j)\rangle\,, \tag{29}$$

where

$$\langle \tilde{\overline{F}}(j), \widetilde{\hat{S}(Q)}(j)\rangle = \sum_{l=0}^{1} \tilde{\overline{F}}_l(j) \left(\widetilde{\hat{S}(Q)}\right)_l(j)\,. \tag{30}$$

In this form, the positivity and commutator conditions can be easily analyzed. First, we decompose the two-point function in its symmetric and antisymmetric parts:

$$\sum_j \langle \tilde{\overline{F}}(j), \widetilde{\hat{S}(Q)}(j) \rangle = \sum_j \langle \tilde{\overline{F}}(j), \widetilde{\hat{S}(Q)}_s(j) \rangle + \sum_j \langle \tilde{\overline{F}}(j), \widetilde{\hat{S}(Q)}_{as}(j) \rangle \ . \tag{31}$$

The antisymmetric part must be equal to the symplectic form,

$$\sum_j \langle \tilde{\overline{F}}(j), \widetilde{\hat{S}(Q)}_{as}(j) \rangle = \frac{i}{2} \int \mathrm{d}^3x \, \sqrt{|h|} \left(\overline{F}_0 Q_1 - \overline{F}_1 Q_0 \right) \ . \tag{32}$$

With the normalization and completeness fulfilled by the eigenfunctions of the laplacian (12), we find

$$\left(\widetilde{S_{as}(Q)} \right)(j) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{i}{2} \\ \frac{-i}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{Q}_0(j) \\ \tilde{Q}_1(j) \end{pmatrix} \ . \tag{33}$$

The positivity condition is expressed by

$$\langle \tilde{\overline{F}}(j), \widetilde{\hat{S}(Q)}(j) \rangle \geqslant 0 \ . \tag{34}$$

Such an operator is represented, for example, by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} |p(j)|^2 & -c^3(t_0) r(j) \overline{p(j)} \\ -c^3(t_0) p(j) \overline{r(j)} & c^6(t_0) |r(j)|^2 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{35}$$

where p and r are polynomially bounded, measurable, and must satisfy

$$p(j)\overline{r(j)} - r(j)\overline{p(j)} = \frac{i}{c^3(t_0)} \ . \tag{36}$$

The matrix is then written as

$$S(j) = \begin{pmatrix} S_{00}(j) & S^{\Re}_{01}(j) \\ S^{\Re}_{01}(j) & S_{11}(j) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{i}{2} \\ -\frac{i}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{37}$$

where $S^{\Re}_{01}$ is a real function of j. Let the first matrix be named S_1. The positivity condition is now

$$\det(S_1) \geqslant \frac{1}{4} \ .$$

The state is pure if

$$\det(S_1) = \frac{1}{4} \ . \tag{38}$$

Lüders and Roberts [11] have shown that the two point function of these states is given by

$$w^{(2)}_{\omega_G}(x, x') = \sum_j \overline{T}_j(t) T_j(t') \Upsilon_j(\underline{x}) \overline{\Upsilon}_j(\underline{x'}) \ . \tag{39}$$

2.4. **Quasifree states on Expanding Spacetimes.**

The discussion about symmetric states becomes meaningless once the spacetimes which we are going to deal with have no spatial symmetries, but the GNS construction presented in section (2.2) still provides us states whose two-point functions can be written as in (39).

Given the state ω and the corresponding cyclic vector $\Omega \in \mathscr{H}_\omega$, we will expand the representation of the field in terms of the operator a, such that

$$a|\Omega\rangle = 0 \ ,$$

and its adjoint $a^\dagger$.

On a general Globally Hyperbolic spacetime, coordinates can always be chosen such that the metric takes the form [21]

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - h_{ij}(t,\underline{x})dx^i dx^j \ , \tag{40}$$

but the Klein-Gordon equation arising from such a metric is not, in general, separable. We make here a further assumption, namely that the metric on the spatial hypersurfaces can be written in the following form:

$$h_{ij}(t,\underline{x}) = c(t)^2 h_{ij}(\underline{x}) \ , \tag{41}$$

that is, we restrict to those spacetimes which we named *Expanding Spacetimes*. Under this condition, the KG equation separates as in (14) and (15), and the field can be expressed as (we use the symbol ϕ to denote both the field and its representation on the Hilbert space generated by the GNS construction)

$$\phi(t,\underline{x}) = \sum_j \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[a_j \overline{T}_j(t) \mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x}) + a_j^\dagger T_j(t) \overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x}) \right] \ . \tag{42}$$

The operator a and its adjoint also follow the mode decomposition. These operators satisfy the usual commutation relations:

$$\left[a_j, a_{j'}\right] = \left[a_j^\dagger, a_{j'}^\dagger\right] = 0 \quad \left[a_j, a_{j'}^\dagger\right] = \delta_{j,j'} \ ,$$

where $\delta_{j,j'}$ is the Kronecker delta.

Evaluated on the state $|\Omega\rangle$, the two-point function of this field operator is (f and q are test functions of compact support)

$$w_\omega^{(2)}\left(\phi(f)\phi(q)\right) = \int \mathrm{d}^4x \sqrt{|g(x)|}\mathrm{d}^4x' \sqrt{|g(x')|}\, f(t,\underline{x})q(s,\underline{x'}) \sum_j \overline{T}_j(t)T_j(s)\mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})\overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x'}) \ . \tag{43}$$

Here we note that this two-point function (43) has the same form as (39). The one we presented in this subsection was formulated for general expanding spacetimes, therefore it has a wider range of aplicability.

3. Definition of the States of Low Energy

The usual definition of vacuum state is a state which is invariant under the symmetries of spacetime and minimizes the total energy over a Cauchy surface. A general curved spacetime possesses no symmetries. Besides, the expectation value of the renormalized energy density evaluated on a Hadamard state in curved spacetime can be arbitrarily negative. The QEIs provide a way to go around the latter problem. With this result in the framework of algebraic quantum field theory, the problem of finding an invariant state, on Robertson-Walker spacetime, on which the expectation value of the energy density is minimized was tackled in [1]. Since this will be useful for our generalizations later, the solution will be sketched now.

The energy density measured by an observer with normalized four-velocity $u^a(x)$ is evaluated from the energy-momentum tensor $T_{ab}(x)$ as

$$\rho(x) = T_{ab}(x)u^a(x)u^b(x) \ , \tag{44}$$

where $T_{ab}(x)$ is the usual energy-momentum tensor of the scalar field

$$T_{ab}(x) = \partial_a\phi(x)\partial_b\phi(x) - \frac{1}{2}g_{ab}(x)\partial^c\phi(x)\partial_c\phi(x) + \frac{1}{2}g_{ab}(x)m^2\phi(x)^2 \ . \tag{45}$$

Adopting an orthonormal frame v^a_μ, such that $v^a_0 = u^a$ and performing a point-splitting procedure, we obtain the regularized energy density

$$\rho(x,x') = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mu=0}^{3} v^a_\mu(x)\nabla_a|_x\phi(x)v^b_\mu(x')\nabla_b|_{x'}\phi(x') + \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi(x)\phi(x') \,. \tag{46}$$

Its expectation value on a state ω is

$$\langle \hat{T}^{reg}\rangle_\omega(x,x') = \left[\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mu=0}^{3} v^a_\mu(x)\nabla_a|_x v^b_\mu(x')\nabla_b|_{x'} + \frac{1}{2}m^2\right] w^{(2)}_\omega(x,x') \,. \tag{47}$$

The renormalized energy density is encountered by subtracting from this expression the expectation value of the energy density on a reference Hadamard state ω_0,

$$\langle \hat{T}^{ren}\rangle_\omega = \langle \hat{T}^{reg}\rangle_\omega - \langle \hat{T}^{reg}\rangle_{\omega_0} \,. \tag{48}$$

The pull-back of the distribution $\langle \hat{T}^{reg}\rangle_\omega(x,x')$ on $\mathcal{M}\times\mathcal{M}$ to a causal curve is again a distribution, $\langle \hat{T}^{reg}\rangle_\omega(t,t')$, on $\mathbb{R}^2$. If one smears this quantity with a smooth test function along a timelike curve, one finds, for any state ω chosen, that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t) \lim_{t'\to t}\langle \hat{T}^{\mathrm{ren}}_{ab}u^a u^b\rangle_\omega(t,t') > -\infty \,. \tag{49}$$

This means that the expectation value of the renormalized energy density on a general Hadamard state, smeared with a smooth test function along a timelike curve, is a lower bounded quantity [14]. (that the smearing is performed with the square of a test function is a technical point). The renormalization counterterms amount to purely geometrical terms [7, 22]. Since these are state independent, they turn out to be irrelevant for the determination of the state of low energy. Therefore, they will not be written in the following.

Now, we can restrict our discussion to the Robertson-Walker spacetime and present the original definition of a SLE. Since this spacetime is homogeneous and isotropic, the energy density depends neither on spatial position nor on direction. Therefore, we can choose an observer with four-velocity $u^a = \delta^a_0$. The mode decomposition of the field allows us to perform the minimization for each mode independently. So, we calculate[3]

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t)\langle \hat{T}^{\mathrm{ren}}_{00}\rangle_\omega(t) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t)\sum_j \frac{1}{2}\left[|\dot{T}_j(t)|^2 + \omega_j^2(t)|T_j(t)|^2 - \ldots\right] \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where the terms referring to $\langle \hat{T}^{reg}\rangle_{\omega_0}$ have been ommited. Since the minimization is going to be performed mode by mode, the ommited terms will amount to a subtracted quantity for each mode, and neither this influences the determination of the state of low energy. Formally, we can write

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t)\langle \hat{T}^{\mathrm{reg}}_{00}\rangle_\omega(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t)\sum_j \frac{1}{2}\left[|\dot{T}_j(t)|^2 + \omega_j^2(t)|T_j(t)|^2\right] =: \sum_j E_j \,. \tag{51}$$

As this expression is divergent, it must be seen as a formal expression. The integrand, though, is not, and we will now concentrate on it. Following the remarks on this paragraph, when we say that the smeared energy density on the state ω will be minimized, we really mean that the smeared renormalized energy density on the state ω will be minimized. These remarks are also valid for the generalizations of the states of low energy we will present below, hence we will consider the generalizations of equation (51) as our starting point.

---

[3] The case of null spatial curvature is trivial. For non-null spatial curvature, see [10, 11].

As we saw in section (2), the solutions to equation (15) have two degrees of freedom, which will be explored now. Using (18) and (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\dot{T}_j(t)|^2 &= (1+2\beta_j^2)|\dot{S}_j(t)|^2 + 2\beta_j \mathrm{Re}(\alpha_j(\dot{S}_j(t))^2) \\ |T_j(t)|^2 &= (1+2\beta_j^2)|S_j(t)|^2 + 2\beta_j \mathrm{Re}(\alpha_j(S_j(t))^2)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} E_j = \frac{1}{2}\int \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t) \Big[& (1+2\beta_j^2)\left(|\dot{S}_j(t)|^2 + \omega_j^2(t)|S_j(t)|^2\right) \\ & +2\beta_j \mathrm{Re}\left(\alpha_j\left((\dot{S}_j(t))^2 + \omega_j^2(t)S_j(t)^2\right)\right)\Big] \\ & = (1+2\beta_j^2)c_{1j} + 2\beta_j \mathrm{Re}(\alpha_j c_{2j}) \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where

$$c_{1j} = \frac{1}{2}\int \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t)\left(|\dot{S}_j(t)|^2 + \omega_j^2(t)|S_j(t)|^2\right) \tag{54}$$

$$c_{2j} = \frac{1}{2}\int \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t)\left((\dot{S}_j(t))^2 + \omega_j^2(t)S_j(t)^2\right)\ . \tag{55}$$

It is easy to see that, choosing

$$\beta_j = \sqrt{\frac{c_{1j}}{2\sqrt{c_{1j}^2 - |c_{2j}|^2}} - \frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_j = e^{i\theta_j}\sqrt{\frac{c_{1j}}{2\sqrt{c_{1j}^2 - |c_{2j}|^2}} + \frac{1}{2}} \tag{56}$$

and

$$\theta_j = -\mathrm{Arg} c_{2j} + \pi\ , \tag{57}$$

we minimize (53). The fact that the minimization consists of a choice of the Bogoliubov parameters is what allows us to neglect the renormalization correction terms right from the beginning. The proof that this state is of the Hadamard form will be left for the next sections, where it will be done together with the proofs for the generalizations of this state.

The only requirements in the construction of this state are invariance under spacetime symmetries (we will show later how this can be extended for spacetimes without symmetries), minimization of the energy density and that it takes into account that it is necessary to smear the energy density along a timelike curve to obtain a lower bounded quantity.

We also remark that the SLE is dependent on the test function used in the smearing. This dependence would only be dropped if the terms between parentheses in equations (54) and (55) could be taken out of the integrals, and this would be the case if and only if $c(t)$ = constant, and in such a case we would have $c_{2j} \equiv 0$ and the SLE would reduce to the vacuum of static Robertson-Walker spacetime. In spite of that, Degner [23] calculated the particle production process in states of low energy on Robertson-Walker spacetimes and showed that the rate of production is not strongly dependent on the test function chosen.

4. Generalization of States of Low Energy

We present here the generalization of the definition of States of Low Energy. We will construct the generalization to Expanding spacetimes without spatial symmetries, but with compact Cauchy surface without boundary. We show that the construction on homogeneous spacetimes is a particular case of the one presented in this section. The constructions follow the same lines as presented above, but there are different technical points.

Since there are no spatial symmetries, the energy density is dependent on position. Therefore we will smear it over a timelike hypersurface, rather than along a timelike curve. Also, as will be made clear below, the Bogolubov parameters would not be constant if the smearing were performed only along a timelike curve. The observers will be chosen to be a family of geodesic observers which are everywhere orthogonal to the Cauchy hypersurfaces. This means that for every such observer, its four velocity $\dot{\gamma}$ is orthogonal to every vector $X \in \mathcal{T}_p\Sigma$, for every point p in Σ.

$$g(\dot{\gamma}, X) \equiv 0 \,. \tag{58}$$

Also, we require that their velocity is normalized, that is,

$$g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) = 1 \,. \tag{59}$$

In the coordinate system we have chosen, at which the metric takes the form (10), the ortogonality condition, (58), becomes

$$g(\dot{\gamma}, X) = -c^2(t) h_{kl}(\underline{x}) \dot{\gamma}^k(t, \underline{x}) X^l(t, \underline{x}) = 0 \;\therefore\; \dot{\gamma}^k \equiv 0 \tag{60}$$

(for the X^l constitute a basis for the space $\mathcal{T}_p\Sigma$). Taking this into account, (59) gives (the positive sign, at the last equality below, is our choice)

$$g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) = (\dot{\gamma}^0)^2 = 1 \;\therefore\; \dot{\gamma}^0 = 1 \,. \tag{61}$$

We will start from the two-point function (43) to construct the SLE. After that, it will remain to prove that it is a Hadamard state (the proof given below will also encompass the above cases). To achieve this aim, we will compare the singularity structure of the SLE to that of Adiabatic States. On a Globally Hyperbolic spacetime without spatial symmetries, the Adiabatic States are only defined and shown to be a Hadamard state if the spatial hypersurfaces are compact [12]. We will then restrict our analysis to these spacetimes. This will allow us, on the following, to consider the test functions as being functions of time only, what is equivalent to writing, for a general test function, $f(t, \underline{x}) = f_t(t) f_x(\underline{x})$ and assume $f_x(\underline{x}) \equiv 1$ on the hypersurface.

Although expressing the energy density in the form (47) is more suitable for geometrical considerations, it will be easier to see the results if we rewrite it in the form

$$\langle \hat{T}^{reg} \rangle_\omega(x, x') = \left[\dot{\gamma}^a(x) \nabla_a|_x \dot{\gamma}^b(x') \nabla_b|_{x'} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^c|_x \nabla_c|_{x'} + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \right] w^{(2)}_\omega(x, x') \,. \tag{62}$$

By doing the same Bogolubov transformation as above (equation (18)), $w^{(2)}_\omega(x, x')$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} w^{(2)}_\omega(x, x') = \sum_j & \Big[(1 + \beta_j^2) \overline{S}_j(t) S_j(s) + \beta_j^2 S_j(t) \overline{S}_j(s) \\ & + 2\beta_j \sqrt{1 + \beta_j^2} \, \mathrm{Re}\left(e^{i\theta_j} S_j(t) S_j(s) \right) \Big] \mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x}) \overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x'}) \\ & =: \sum_j w^{(2)}_{\omega_j}(x, x') \,. \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

where $\alpha_j = e^{i\theta_j} \sqrt{1 + \beta_j^2}$.

Defining

$$\langle \hat{T}^{reg} \rangle_{\omega_j}(x, x') := \left[\dot{\gamma}^a(x) \nabla_a|_x \dot{\gamma}^b(x') \nabla_b|_{x'} - \frac{1}{2} \nabla^c|_x \nabla_c|_{x'} + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \right] w^{(2)}_{\omega_j}(x, x') \tag{64}$$

and inserting (63) into (64), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \hat{T}^{reg} \rangle_{\omega_j}(t, \underline{x}) = \\
&\frac{1}{2}(1+2\beta_j^2)\left\{|\dot{S}_j(t)|^2|\mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})|^2 + |S_j(t)|^2\left(c(t)^{-2}h^{kl}(\underline{x})\nabla_k \mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})\nabla_l \overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x}) + m^2|\mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})|^2\right)\right\} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}2\beta_j\sqrt{1+\beta_j^2}\mathrm{Re}\left\{e^{i\theta_j}\left[\left(\dot{S}_j(t)\right)^2|\mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})|^2\right.\right. \\
&\left.\left.+\left(S_j(t)\right)^2\left(c(t)^{-2}h^{kl}(\underline{x})\nabla_k \mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})\nabla_l \overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x}) + m^2|\mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})|^2\right)\right]\right\} . \qquad (65)
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear from this equation that, if the energy density is not smeared also in space, the parameters β_j and θ_j might not be constants. The smeared energy density is now

$$\sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t) \int_\Sigma \mathrm{d}^3x\, \sqrt{|h|}\, \langle \hat{T}^{reg} \rangle_{\omega_j}(t, \underline{x}) = \sum_j E_j\, . \qquad (66)$$

Since the spatial hypersurfaces are compact without boundary, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Sigma \mathrm{d}^3x\, \sqrt{|h|}\, h^{kl}(\underline{x})\nabla_k \mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})\nabla_l \overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x}) &= -\int_\Sigma \mathrm{d}^3x\, \sqrt{|h|}\, \mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})\Delta_h \overline{\mathrm{Y}}_j(\underline{x}) \\
&= \lambda_j \int_\Sigma \mathrm{d}^3x\, \sqrt{|h|}\, |\mathrm{Y}_j(\underline{x})|^2 = \lambda_j\, . \qquad (67)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_j = {} & (1+2\beta_j^2)\frac{1}{2}\int \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t)\left(|\dot{S}_j(t)|^2 + \omega_j^2(t)|S_j(t)|^2\right) \\
& + 2\beta_j\sqrt{1+\beta_j^2}\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Re}\left\{e^{i\theta_j}\int \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t)\left((\dot{S}_j(t))^2 + \omega_j^2(t)S_j(t)^2\right)\right\}\, , \qquad (68)
\end{aligned}$$

and the energy density is, again, minimized by choosing the Bogolubov parameters as (56), where c_{1j} and c_{2j} are the same as (54) and (55), and θ_j given by (57). We will refer to these states of low energy as ω_{SLE}, and their two-point function, $w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}}$.

This state is different from the former one because here we minimize the mean value of the energy density over a timelike slab of spacetime (containing entirely a Cauchy hypersurface and extended in time). Besides, the treatment given here does not depend on the occurrence of spatial symmetries. We also note that, had we chosen an arbitrary causal observer, would the energy density contain terms of the form $\dot{\gamma}^0\dot{\gamma}^l\nabla_0|_x\nabla_l|_{x'}w^{(2)}_\omega(x, x')$, which could spoil the positivity of (54), thus compromising the minimization of the energy density. Even in the homogeneous, but anisotropic case, would such a term lead to this problem.

5. Fulfillment of the Hadamard condition by the SLE

It still remains to show that the SLE are Hadamard states. For this purpose, we will use the concept of Adiabatic states, which will give us an explicit ansatz for $T_j(t)$ and are known to be Hadamard states. For this last statement a refinement on the definition of Wavefront sets will be required.

5.1. **Adiabatic States.**

Adiabatic states were introduced long ago [10] with the purpose of analyzing particle production on curved spacetimes. But this discussion is only meaningful for asymptotically flat spacetimes, for only then (as in scattering) one has - in the infrared region - asymptotic freedom and is able to define a vacuum state and interpret particles as excitations over this state (actually, also invariance under the symmetries of spacetime is required, for a precise definition of vacuum state).

Under these circumstances, the adiabatic states were formulated as those states which minimize the particle production.

On another hand, this definition was mathematically ill-defined, because it was based on an iteration procedure which, in general, does not converge. Only much later it was shown that, under some restrictions, this problem can be solved, and the physical properties of this state were clarified [11]. The comparison between Adiabatic states and Hadamard states is more delicate. It requires a refinement of the notion of Wavefront set. We present this notion now [24].

Definition 5.1.1. *For* $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *is the set of tempered distributions such that* $\hat{u}$ *is locally square integrable and* $(1+|k|^2)^s\hat{u} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, i.e.,*

$$||u||^2_{H^2} := \int d^nk\,(1+|k|^2)^s|\hat{u}(k)|^2 < \infty\,.$$

The spaces $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ have the following properties:

(i) If $s > l + n/2$, then $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset C^l(\mathbb{R}^n)$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$;
(ii) $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset H^{s'}(\mathbb{R}^n)\ \forall s \geqslant s'$;
(iii) $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is closed under multiplication by smooth functions.

The distribution $u \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is said to be microlocally H^s at $(x,k) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times (\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\})$ if there exists a conic neighborhood V of k and $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\phi(x) \neq 0$, such that

$$\int_V \mathrm{d}^nk\,\left(1+|k|^2\right)^s |[\phi u]^\wedge(k)|^2 \leqslant \infty$$

Definition 5.1.2. *The Sobolev Wavefront set* WF^s *of a distribution* $u \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *is the complement, in* $\mathcal{T}^*\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}$*, of the set of all pairs* (x,k) *at which* u *is microlocally* H^s*.*

So far the Sobolev Wavefront set (and also the smooth Wavefront set, defined in subsection (2.2)) is only defined for distributions on $\mathbb{R}^n$, hence the Fourier transformation indicated in Definition (5.1.1) (also (2.2.1)) means convolution with plane waves, e^{ikx}, not with a general eigenfunction of the laplacian. Junker and Schrohe [12] observed that this definition can be extended to distributions defined on a compact manifold without boundary Σ as follows: We choose on Σ a covering by coordinate neighborhoods with coordinate maps $\{\mathcal{U}_k, \kappa_k\}_{k=1,\dots,K}$ with a subordinate partition of unity $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1,\dots,K}$. Given a distribution u on Σ, we shall say that $u \in H^s(\Sigma)$ if, for each k, the push-forward of $\varphi_k u$ under κ_k is an element of $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Also, they observed that, denoting by Δ_h the Laplace-Beltrami operator with respect to the metric h on Σ, we have

$$H^{2k}(\Sigma) = \left\{u \in L^2(\Sigma);\ (1-\Delta)^k u \in L^2(\Sigma)\right\}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. They went further and also showed that for any paracompact smooth manifold $\mathcal{M}$ the Sobolev Wavefront set of a distribution defined on it is a subset of $\mathcal{T}^*\mathcal{M}\setminus\{0\}$. Besides, they proved the following Lemma:

Lemma 5.1.1. *For every Hadamard state* ω_H *we have*

$$WF^s(w^{(2)}_{\omega_H}) = \left\{\begin{array}{ll} \emptyset\,, & s < -1/2 \\ C^+\,, & s \geqslant -1/2 \end{array}\right.\,. \tag{69}$$

The Adiabatic states are formulated iteratively (see below). For the $N-$th order of iteration, Junker and Schrohe defined the Adiabatic states ω_N by their singularity structure:

Definition 5.1.3. *A quasifree state* ω_N *on the Weyl algebra* $\mathscr{W}\,(Re(\mathsf{K}(\mathcal{M})),\sigma)$ *is an Adiabatic State of order* N *if,* $\forall s < N + 3/2$,

$$WF^s(w^{(2)}_{\omega_N}) = C^+\,. \tag{70}$$

Comparing this last with Lemma (5.1.1), we have that

$$WF^s(w^{(2)}_{\omega_H} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_N}) = \emptyset \quad , \quad \forall s < N + 3/2\,. \tag{71}$$

Junker and Schrohe showed that, on Robertson-Walker spacetimes and on spacetimes with compact Cauchy hypersurfaces, the explicit construction given in [11] satisfies the WF^s condition. This fact was used by Olbermann [1] to show that the SLE is a Hadamard state. We now quote the analysis of adiabatic states given in [11] (with some changes in notation), and note that this result is valid for any spacetime on which the metric decomposes as (10) and the Klein Gordon equation, as (10).

The adiabatic solution is of the WKB form

$$W_j(x^0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\Omega_j(x^0)c(x^0)^3}} \exp\left(i \int_{t_0}^{x^0} \mathrm{d}t'\, \Omega_j(t') \right)\,. \tag{72}$$

It satisfies automatically (17). (15) is also satisfied if

$$\Omega_j^2 = \omega_j^2 - \frac{3(\dot{c})^2}{4c^2} - \frac{3\ddot{c}}{2c} + \frac{3(\dot{\Omega}_j)^2}{4(\Omega_j)^2} - \frac{\ddot{\Omega}_j}{2\Omega_j}\,. \tag{73}$$

One attempts to solve this equation iteratively:

$$\Omega_j^{(0)} = \omega_j$$

$$(\Omega_j^{(n+1)})^2 = \omega_j^2 - \frac{3(\dot{c})^2}{4c^2} - \frac{3\ddot{c}}{2c} + \frac{3(\dot{\Omega}_j^{(n)})^2}{4(\Omega_j^{(n)})^2} - \frac{\ddot{\Omega}_j^{(n)}}{2\Omega_j^{(n)}}\,. \tag{74}$$

These expressions will be taken as only determining the initial conditions of the solutions to the field equation, because there can be values of j and x^0 for which the right hand side of (74) is negative. We will make considerations on the convergence of this iteration below. So, let $S_j^{(n)}(t)$ be a solution, having initial values

$$S_j^{(n)}(t_0) = W_j^{(n)}(t_0) \qquad ; \qquad \dot{S}_j^{(n)}(t_0) = \dot{W}_j^{(n)}(t_0)\,. \tag{75}$$

It can be shown that

$$S_j^{(n)}(t) = \varsigma_j^{(n)}(t) W_j^{(n)}(t) + \xi_j^{(n)}(t) \overline{W}_j^{(n)}(t)\,, \tag{76}$$

where

$$\varsigma_j^{(n)}(t) = 1 - \int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t'\, R(t') \left[\varsigma_j^{(n)}(t') + \xi_j^{(n)}(t') \exp\left(-2i \int^{t'} \mathrm{d}t''\, \Omega_j^{(n)}(t'') \right) \right] \tag{77}$$

$$\xi_j^{(n)}(t) = \int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t'\, R(t') \left[\xi_j^{(n)}(t') + \varsigma_j^{(n)}(t') \exp\left(2i \int^{t'} \mathrm{d}t''\, \Omega_j^{(n)}(t'') \right) \right] \tag{78}$$

$$R = \frac{1}{2}\Omega_j^{-1} \left(\Omega_j^2 - \frac{3(\dot{\Omega}_j)^2}{4(\Omega_j)^2} + \frac{\ddot{\Omega}_j}{2\Omega_j} - \omega_j^2 + \frac{3(\dot{c})^2}{4c^2} + \frac{3\ddot{c}}{2c} + \right)\,. \tag{79}$$

To determine the behavior of this solution, we must analyze its dependence on λ_j. Instead of verifying the convergence of (74) for an arbitrary time interval, we will restrict ourselves to a finite interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. The fact that, for j sufficiently large, the iteration converges, can be presented in the following Lemma:

Lemma 5.1.2. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a closed interval. Then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there is a $\chi_n(I) \geqslant 0$ such that, setting*

$$R_n(I) := \left\{ (\lambda_j, x^0) : x^0 \in I; \lambda_j \geqslant \chi_n(I) \right\}\,,$$

$\Omega^{(n)}$ *is strictly positive on* $R_n(I)$ *and* $\Omega^{(n)}$ *and all its derivatives with respect to time are continuous on* $R_n(I)$. *Furthermore, there are constants* $A, B > 0$ *such that*

$$A(1+\lambda_j)^{1/2} \leqslant \Omega_j^{(n)}(x^0) \leqslant B(1+\lambda_j)^{1/2} \quad , \quad (\lambda_j, x^0) \in R_n(I) \; .$$

Besides, writing

$$(\Omega_j^{(n)})^2 = (\Omega_j^{(n-1)})^2(1+\varepsilon_n)$$

and defining the space $\mathcal{J}_n$ *such that, for every given function* $f(\lambda_j, t)$, $t \in I$, $f \in \mathcal{J}_n(I)$ *means that exist constants* $c_m > 0$, $m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, *and* $b > 0$ *such that*

$$|f^{(m)}(\lambda_j, t)| \leqslant c_m \lambda_j^n \quad , \quad t \in I \quad , \quad \lambda_j \geqslant b \; .$$

Then, $\Omega_j^{(n)} \in \mathcal{J}_{1/2}$ *and* $\varepsilon_n \in \mathcal{J}_{-n}$.

Proof. It is immediate to see that $(\Omega_j^{(0)})^2 \in \mathcal{J}_1$ and $(\Omega_j^{(0)})^{-2} \in \mathcal{J}_{-1}$, therefore

$$\frac{\dot{\Omega}_j^{(0)}}{\Omega_j^{(0)}} \in \mathcal{J}_0 \quad , \quad \frac{\ddot{\Omega}_j^{(0)}}{\Omega_j^{(0)}} \in \mathcal{J}_0 \; .$$

Taking $n = 0$ in (74), one has

$$(\Omega_j^{(0)})^2(1+\varepsilon_1) \sim \lambda_j \therefore (\Omega_j^{(0)})^2 \varepsilon_1 \in \mathcal{J}_0 \therefore \varepsilon_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{-1} \; .$$

To generalize this result for all n, we need some relations: From $\Omega_j^{(n)} = \Omega_j^{(n-1)} \sqrt{1+\varepsilon_n}$ follows

$$\frac{\dot{\Omega}_j^{(n)}}{\Omega_j^{(n)}} = \frac{\dot{\Omega}_j^{(n-1)}}{\Omega_j^{(n-1)}} + \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_n}{2(1+\varepsilon_n)} = \frac{\dot{\Omega}_j^{(0)}}{\Omega_j^{(0)}} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_i}{(1+\varepsilon_i)} \; , \tag{80}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{n+1} = \frac{1}{\Omega_j^{(0)} \prod_{i=1}^n (1+\varepsilon_i)} \Bigg[& \frac{1}{4}\frac{\dot{\Omega}_j^{(0)}}{\Omega_j^{(0)}} \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_n}{(1+\varepsilon_n)} + \frac{1}{8}\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_n}{1+\varepsilon_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_i}{(1+\varepsilon_i)} \\ & + \frac{5}{16}\frac{(\dot{\varepsilon}_n)^2}{(1+\varepsilon_n)^2} - \frac{1}{4}\frac{\ddot{\varepsilon}_n}{(1+\varepsilon_n)} \Bigg] \; . \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

Supposing that $\varepsilon_n \in \mathcal{J}_{-n}$, it is clear from (81) that $\varepsilon_{n+1} \in \mathcal{J}_{-n-1}$.

Then, $(\Omega_j^{(n)})^2 = (\Omega_j^{(n-1)})^2(1+\varepsilon_n)$ gives $\Omega_j^{(n)} \in \mathcal{J}_{1/2}$. □

From Lemma (5.1.2) and (72), it is clear that

$$|W_j| \in \mathcal{J}_{-1/4} \quad \text{and} \quad |\dot{W}_j| \in \mathcal{J}_{1/4} \; . \tag{82}$$

From (79) and (74), taking Ω as $\Omega^{(n)}$,

$$R^{(n)} = \frac{1}{2}(\Omega^{(n)})^{-1}\left((\Omega^{(n)})^2 - (\Omega^{(n+1)})^2\right) = -\frac{1}{2}\Omega^{(n)}\varepsilon_{n+1} \therefore R^{(n)} \in \mathcal{J}_{-n-1/2} \; . \tag{83}$$

The behavior of $\varsigma_j(t)$ and $\xi_j(t)$ can be analyzed by rewriting equations (77) and (78) in matrix notation. Let $x = \begin{pmatrix} \varsigma \\ \xi \end{pmatrix}$,

$$x = y + Rx \; , \tag{84}$$

where $y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $(Rx)(t) = \int_{t_1}^{t} \mathrm{d}t' R(t')x(t')$ and $R(t')$ is the 2×2 matrix derived from (77) and (78). The solution to equation (84) can be found using standard Volterra-Lotka methods, and it was presented in appendix B of [11]. We just quote the result:

Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a closed interval. $\forall t \in I$, $\exists C_\xi, C_\varsigma > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_j(t)| &\leqslant C_\xi (1+\lambda_j)^{-n-1/2} \ , \\ |1-\varsigma_j(t)| &\leqslant C_\varsigma (1+\lambda_j)^{-n-1/2} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

Now we will show that, under compatible conditions, $WF^s(w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_N}) = \emptyset$ and, by the property (22), which is also valid for WF^s, we will have $WF^s(w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_H}) = \emptyset$. The analysis of the asymptotic behavior of the time-dependent part of the states of low energy presented next follows directly from [1], again with some changes in notation.

5.2. **Fulfillment of conditions.**

From (76), (82) and (85),

$$\partial_t^{(k)} S_j^{(n)}(t) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{k/2-1/4}) \ . \tag{86}$$

This characterizes almost completely the adiabatic state (the dependence of $\Upsilon_j(\underline{x})$ and its derivatives will be presented later).

The SLE is given by (63), where β_j, c_{1j} and c_{2j} are given by (56), (54) and (55), respectively. Since $c_{1j} > c_{2j}$,

$$2\beta_j^2 \approx \frac{1}{2}\frac{|c_{2j}|^2}{c_{1j}^2} + \frac{1}{4}\frac{|c_{2j}|^4}{c_{1j}^4} + \ldots \tag{87}$$

From (54) and (86), it is immediate to see that

$$c_{1j} \in \mathcal{J}_{1/2} \ . \tag{88}$$

The analysis of the behavior of c_{2j} is more involved. $S_n^{(n)}(t)$ can be written as (we will omit the indices)

$$\begin{aligned} S &= |W| \left(\varsigma e^{i\int\Omega} + \xi e^{-i\int\Omega} \right) \therefore \\ (\dot{S})^2 &= |\dot{W}|^2 \left(\varsigma^2 e^{2i\int\Omega} + \xi^2 e^{-2i\int\Omega} + 2\varsigma\xi \right) \\ &\quad + |W|^2 \left[(\dot{\varsigma} + i\Omega\varsigma)^2 e^{2i\int\Omega} + (\dot{\xi} - i\Omega\xi)^2 e^{-2i\int\Omega} + 2(\dot{\varsigma} + i\Omega\varsigma)(\dot{\xi} - i\Omega\xi) \right] \\ &\quad + 2|\dot{W}||W| \left(\varsigma e^{i\int\Omega} + \xi e^{-i\int\Omega} \right) \left[(\dot{\varsigma} + i\Omega\varsigma) e^{i\int\Omega} + (\dot{\xi} - i\Omega\xi) e^{-i\int\Omega} \right] \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

The asymptotic behavior of the individual terms is known:

$$\begin{aligned} (\varsigma_j^{(n)})^2 &= 1 + (\varsigma+1)(\varsigma-1) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-2n-1}) \\ (\xi_j^{(n)})^2 &= \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-2n-1}) \\ \varsigma_j^{(n)}\xi_j^{(n)} &= \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-n-1/2}) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

Keeping only the highest order terms (with and without the exponentials, individually), (90), (82) and (55) give

$$c_{2j}^{(n)} = \frac{1}{2}\int \mathrm{d}t\, f^2(t) \left(|\dot{W}_j^{(n)}(t)|^2 + \omega_j^2(t) |W_j^{(n)}(t)|^2 \right) \exp\left(2i \int \Omega \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-n}) \tag{91}$$

Olbermann [1] proved the following Lemma, which makes the estimate for c_{2j} more precise.

Lemma 5.2.1. *Let $P(\lambda_j, t) \in \mathcal{J}_m(I)$. For $M \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $C_M > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \int dt\, f(t)^2 P(\lambda_j, t) \exp\left(2i \int_{t_1}^{t} dt' \Omega(t') \right) \right| \leq C_M (1+\lambda_j)^{-(M/2)+m}. \tag{92}$$

From this Lemma, we see that the first term in (91) can be arbitrarily small, and therefore $c^{(n)}_{2j} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-n})$. Therefore,

$$\beta^{(n)}_j = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-n-1/2}) \ . \tag{93}$$

Now we need to impose estimates on the asymptotic behavior of the eigenfunctions of the laplacian. For that, we quote some theorems that can be found in the literature:

Definition 5.2.1. *The intersection index $i(\Sigma)$ of Σ is the supremum of the number of intersection points of Σ with any p-plane transverse to Σ in $\mathbb{R}^{m+p}$ (considering* $\dim(\Sigma) = m$, *Σ immersed in $\mathbb{R}^{m+p}$).*

$$i(\Sigma) = \sup_{\Pi} \#\Sigma \cap \Pi$$

Theorem 5.2.1. [25] *For every compact m-dimensional immersed submanifold Σ of $\mathbb{R}^{m+p}$ and every positive integer j,*

$$\lambda_j \leqslant c(m) \left(\frac{i(\Sigma)}{Vol(\Sigma)} \right)^{(2/m)} j^{(2/m)} \ , \tag{94}$$

where $m = \dim(\Sigma)$ and $c(m)$ is a constant.

Theorem 5.2.2. [26] *Let Σ be a compact manifold with or without boundary. Suppose λ_j is the j-th nonzero eigenvalue on Σ. Then, there exists a constant $a(m)$ and $C > 0$ such that*

$$\lambda_j \geqslant C \left(\frac{a(m)}{Vol(\Sigma)} \right)^{(2/m)} j^{(2/m)} \ . \tag{95}$$

The spectral function of a elliptic self-adjoint differential operator P on a compact manifold Σ is defined as

$$e(\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \lambda) := \sum_{\lambda_j \leqslant \lambda} Y_j(\underline{x}) \overline{Y}_j(\underline{y}) \ , \tag{96}$$

where λ_j are the eigenvalues, and Y_j, the eigenfunctions, of the operator P. Hörmander [27] proves that, if P is a first order self-adjoint, elliptic differential operator, and Q is a differential operator of order μ, then the following inequality is valid:

$$|Q(e(\cdot, \cdot, \lambda))| \leqslant C_Q \lambda^{m+\mu} \tag{97}$$

where m is the dimension of *Sigma*. An extension of this result [28] gives that

$$\sum_{\lambda_j \leqslant \lambda} |\partial^k Y_j(\underline{x})|^2 = C_{m,k} \lambda^{m+2|k|} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{m+2|k|-1}) \ , \ \ C_{m,k} > 0 \ . \tag{98}$$

Combining these results with the theorems, we obtain

$$|\partial^k Y_j(\underline{x})|^2 \leqslant \sum_{\lambda_l \leqslant \lambda_j} |\partial^k Y_l(\underline{x})|^2 = C_{m,k} \lambda_j^{m+2|k|} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{m+2|k|-1})$$

$$|\partial^k Y_j| = \mathcal{O}(j^{1+2|k|/3}) \ . \tag{99}$$

Now, we are ready to prove that the SLE are Hadamard states. It is known that the adiabatic states ω_N on spacetimes with metric (10) and compact Cauchy surface are Hadamard states. To show that the SLE are Hadamard, it suffices to show that

$$w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_N} \in H^s(\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}) \ ,$$

for $s < N + 3/2$. Besides,

$$C^l(\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}) \subset H^s(\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}) \quad \forall s < l - \frac{1}{2} \dim(\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}) \ .$$

All that is needed is to show that

$$w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_N} \in C^l(\mathcal{M}\times\mathcal{M}) \tag{100}$$

for some l.

$$(w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_N})(t,\underline{x};t',\underline{x'}) = \sum_j \left(\overline{T}_j(t)T_j(t') - \overline{S}^{(n)}_j(t)S^{(n)}_j(t')\right)\Upsilon_j(\underline{x})\overline{\Upsilon}_j(\underline{x'}) \ . \tag{101}$$

We will verify the convergence by calculating

$$\partial^k_{x,x'}(w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_N})(x;x') = \sum_j \partial^k_{x,x'}\left[\left(\overline{T}_j(t)T_j(t') - \overline{S}^{(n)}_j(t)S^{(n)}_j(t')\right)\Upsilon_j(\underline{x})\overline{\Upsilon}_j(\underline{x'})\right] \ . \tag{102}$$

From equation (63),

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{T}_j(t)T_j(t') - \overline{S}^{(n)}_j(t)S^{(n)}_j(t') &= (\beta^{(n)}_j)^2\left[S^{(n)}_j(t)\overline{S}^{(n)}_j(t') + S^{(n)}_j(t')\overline{S}^{(n)}_j(t)\right]\\ &+ 2\beta^{(n)}_j\sqrt{1+(\beta^{(n)}_j)^2}\,\mathrm{Re}\left[e^{i\theta_j}S^{(n)}_j(t)S^{(n)}_j(t')\right] \ .\end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

From (86) and (93), the last term has the largest order in j. I will only consider this term for convergence matters.

Collecting some results above ((86), (93), (94), (95), (99)), we have

$$\partial^k_t S^{(n)}_j(t) = \mathcal{O}(j^{k/3-1/6}) \tag{104}$$

$$|\partial^k \Upsilon_j(\underline{x})| = \mathcal{O}(j^{1+2|k|/3}) \tag{105}$$

$$\beta^{(n)}_j = \mathcal{O}(j^{-2n/3-1/3}) \tag{106}$$

It is easy to see that the term of largest order in (102) is $\partial^k_{\underline{x},\underline{x'}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^k_{\underline{x},\underline{x'}}\left[\left(\overline{T}_j(t)T_j(t') - \overline{S}^{(n)}_j(t)S^{(n)}_j(t')\right)\Upsilon_j(\underline{x})\overline{\Upsilon}_j(\underline{x'})\right] &= \mathcal{O}\left(-\frac{1}{3}-\frac{2n}{3}-\frac{1}{3}+2\left(1+\frac{2k}{3}\right)\right)\\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{4k}{3}-\frac{2n}{3}+\frac{4}{3}\right) \ .\end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

The sum in (102) can be estimated by an integral, as if j was a continuous parameter. Since the corresponding continuous cotangent space would be $3-$dimensional, the corresponding integral is absolutely convergent if

$$\frac{4k}{3}-\frac{2n}{3}+\frac{4}{3} < -3 \therefore k < \frac{n}{2}-\frac{13}{4} \ . \tag{108}$$

This means

$$w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_N} \in C^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2}-\frac{13}{4}\rfloor}(\mathcal{M}\times\mathcal{M}) \ , \tag{109}$$

where

$$\lfloor x\rfloor := \begin{cases} \max\{m\in\mathbb{Z}|m\leqslant x\} \ , & x>0 \\ 0 \ , & x\leqslant 0 \end{cases} \ . \tag{110}$$

Finally,

$$WF^s(w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_N}) = \emptyset \quad \text{for} \quad s < \frac{n}{2}-\frac{29}{4} \ . \tag{111}$$

Since $n+\frac{3}{2} > \frac{n}{2}-\frac{29}{4}$,

$$WF^s(w^{(2)}_{\omega_{SLE}} - w^{(2)}_{\omega_H}) = \emptyset \quad \text{for} \quad s < \frac{n}{2}-\frac{29}{4} \ . \tag{112}$$

This proves that States of Low Energy on globally hyperbolic spacetimes with metric of the form (10) and compact Cauchy surface are Hadamard states. We remark that this proof is also valid for the homogeneous spacetime streated above.

6. Conclusions

We have constructed Hadamard states on expanding spacetimes without spatial symmetries. These states were formulated in such a way that the expectation value of the energy density is minimized and this minimal value cannot be arbitrarily negative. Further, we have generalized a procedure which relied on the symmetries of the spacetime.

Although this is a more general definition of States of Low Energy than the original one, we do not claim that this construction is the most general possible, because, generically, the metric on a globally hyperbolic spacetime is of the form (40). Our construction still relies on the existence of time independent modes. Furthermore, the states are defined for the particular test function chosen for the smearing. Although the particle production process in Robertson-Walker spacetime was shown not to be strongly dependent on it, the complete role played by the test function on observational results is not yet well understood.

At last we remark that, in the absence of spatial symmetries, the energy density must be also smeared in space, for it is dependent on spatial position and it makes no sense to evaluate it on a particular, arbitrarily chosen, point.

7. Acknowledgements

Part of this work was based on the diploma thesis of Kolja Them [Them10], which was done under the supervision of Prof. Klaus Fredenhagen. Kolja Them would like to thank Prof. Fredenhagen, Thomas Hack and (former) members of the AQFT group at the University of Hamburg for several discussions. Marcos Brum would like to thank the AQFT group at the University of Hamburg for the hospitality during the period of preparation of this work. MB also acknowledges financial support from the brazilian agency CAPES under Grant nr 869211-4.

References

[1] Heiner Olbermann. States of low energy on Robertson−Walker spacetimes. Classical and Quantum Gravity, 24(20):5011, 2007.

[2] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, and M. Köhler. The microlocal spectrum condition and wick polynomials of free fields on curved spacetimes. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 180:633–652, 1996.

[3] Romeo Brunetti and Klaus Fredenhagen. Microlocal Analysis and Interacting Quantum Field Theories: Renormalization on Physical Backgrounds. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 208:623–661, 2000.

[4] Stefan Hollands and Robert M. Wald. Existence of Local Covariant Time Ordered Products of Quantum Fields in Curved Spacetime. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 231:309–345, 2002.

[5] O. Bratteli and D. W. Robinson. Operator Algebras and Quantum Statistical Mechanics 1: C*- and W*-Algebras. Symmetry Groups. Decomposition of States. Springer, 2003.

[6] Bernard S. Kay and Robert M. Wald. Theorems on the uniqueness and thermal properties of stationary, nonsingular, quasifree states on spacetimes with a bifurcate killing horizon. Physics Reports, 207(2):49 – 136, 1991.

[7] R. M. Wald. Quantum Field Theory in Curved Spacetime and Black Hole Thermodynamics. Chicago Lectures in Physics. University of Chicago Press, 1994.

[8] Rainer Verch. Local definiteness, primarity and quasiequivalence of quasifree hadamard quantum states in curved spacetime. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 160:507–536, 1994.

[9] C. Bär, N. Ginoux, and F. Pfäffle. Wave Equations on Lorentzian Manifolds and Quantization. Esi Lectures in Mathematics and Physics. European Mathematical Society, 2007.

[10] Leonard Parker. Quantized Fields and Particle Creation in Expanding Universes. I. Phys. Rev., 183:1057–1068, 1969.

[11] Christian Lüders and John E. Roberts. Local quasiequivalence and adiabatic vacuum states. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 134:29–63, 1990.

[12] W. Junker and E. Schrohe. Adiabatic Vacuum States on General Spacetime Manifolds: Definition, Construction, and Physical Properties. Annales Henri Poincaré, 3:1113–1181, 2002.

[13] H. Epstein, V. Glaser, and A. Jaffe. Nonpositivity of the Energy Density in Quantized Field Theories. Il Nuovo Cimento, 36:1016–1022, 1965.

[14] Christopher J Fewster. A general worldline quantum inequality. Classical and Quantum Gravity, 17(9):1897, 2000.

[15] Christopher J. Fewster and Calvin J. Smith. Absolute Quantum Energy Inequalities in Curved Spacetime. Annales Henri Poincaré, 9:425–455, 2008.

[16] H. Stephani et al. Exact Solutions of Einstein's Field Equations. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[17] J. Dimock. Algebras of local observables on a manifold. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 77:219–228, 1980.

[18] J. Jost. Riemannian Geometry and Geometric Analysis. Universitext - Springer-Verlag. Springer, 6 edition, 2011.

[19] Marek J. Radzikowski. Micro-local approach to the hadamard condition in quantum field theory on curved space-time. Communications in Mathematical Physics, 179:529–553, 1996.

[20] L. Hörmander. The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I: Distribution theory and Fourier Analysis. Springer, 1983.

[21] R. M. Wald. General Relativity. Physics/Astrophysics. University of Chicago Press, 1984.

[22] Thomas-Paul Hack. On the Backreaction of Scalar and Spinor Quantum Fields in Curved Spacetimes. 2010. gr-qc/1008.1776.

[23] Andreas Degner and Rainer Verch. Cosmological particle creation in states of low energy. J.Math.Phys., 51:022302, 2010.

[24] M. Reed and B. Simon. Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness. Elsevier, 1975.

[25] Bruno Colbois, Emily B. Dryden, and Ahmad El Soufi. Bounding the eigenvalues of the laplacebeltrami operator on compact submanifolds. Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society, 42(1):96–108, 2010.

[26] Shiu-Yuen Cheng and Peter Li. Heat kernel estimates and lower bound of eigenvalues. Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici, 56:327–338, 1981.

[27] L. Hörmander. The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators IV: Fourier Integral Operators. Classics in Mathematics. Springer, 1994.

[28] Bin Xu. Asymptotic behavior of L^2-normalized eigenfunctions of the Laplace−Beltrami operator on a closed Riemannian manifold. 2005. math/0509061v2.

Institute of Applied Physics and Microstructure Research Center, University of Hamburg – Jungiusstrasse 11, D-20355 Hamburg (HH), Germany
E-mail address: `kthem@physnet.uni-hamburg.de`

Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Caixa Postal 68528, Rio de Janeiro, RJ 21941-972, Brazil; II. Institut für theoretische Physik, Universität Hamburg – Luruper Chaussee 149, D-22761 Hamburg (HH), Germany
E-mail address: `mbrum@if.ufrj.br; marcos.brum@desy.de`